

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,391	07/19/2000	Roman Schertler	622/40901C2	2663
7:	590 07/22/2005		EXAM	INER
CROWELL & MORING LLP			JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL	
Intellectual Pro	perty Group			
P.O. Box 14300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20044-4300			3726	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/619,391	SCHERTLER, ROMAN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Marc Jimenez	3726
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory portion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may oly within the statutory minimum of I will apply and will expire SIX (6) Note, te, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 A	April 2005.	
	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal m	atters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35-43,45-54,72 and 73</u> is/are pendin	og in the application	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	- ' '	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	ann morn oonoloolanom.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35-43,45-54,72 and 73</u> is/are rejecte	ed.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin		
•		to but be Evenien
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
	.xammor. Note the attack	led Office Action of form F 10-132.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 	•	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have be	en received in this National Stage
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies n	not received.
•		
Attachment(s)	<u>-</u>	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 		No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/619,391

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 35-43, 45-54, 72, and 73 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 and 58-83 of copending Application No. 08/962,776 (hereinafter '776). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant invention claims essentially the same invention claimed in the '776 application as follows.

The instant invention claims: "A vacuum process apparatus for processing at least one workpiece, comprising a chamber with two openings defining respective opening areas, and a transport device with said vacuum chamber having a drive shaft rotatable around a rotational axis of said drive shaft" (see claim 1, lines 1-15 of '776), "two conveyors defining a support plane for at least one workpiece each, and a transport arm for each conveyor" (see claim 1, lines 16-21 of '776), "said arms are operatively coupled to said conveyors to move said conveyors

Page 3

independently of each other with a radial component relative to said drive shaft" (see claim 1, lines 25-28 of '776), "said conveyors comprising a seal member" (see claim 10, line 2 of '776).

Therefore, the instant invention claims essentially the same features of the '776 application with the exception of the instant invention claiming the use of a conveyors "mounted opposite each other" and "projecting from said drive shaft" which is not claimed in the '776 application. However, official notice is taken that it was well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used conveyors mounted opposite each other, in order to provide transportation of multiple workpieces. Furthermore, official notice is taken that it was well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided conveyors projecting from the drive shaft, in order to provide rotation and controlled movement of the conveyors.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 3. examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number is (571) 272-4530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3726

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

MJ July 5, 2005